

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/663,010	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CLAROT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> James H. Alstrum-Acevedo	<b>Art Unit</b> 1616	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James H. Alstrum-Acevedo. (3)\_\_\_\_\_

(2) Ms. Cindy Pillote. (4)\_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 25 January 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ms. Pillote called to discuss the prior office action because she believed that many claims were not rejected with prior art (e.g. 1, 2, 11-15, and 27-29). Examiner Alstrum-Acevedo clarified that all the claims were rejected with prior art, and agreed that the presentation of the rejected claims in the office action mailed July 24, 2006 was confusing. To clarify the record, the Examiner agreed to vacate the previous office action, send a supplemental office action clarifying which claims were rejected by art, and to reset the time for reply to begin from the mailing of the supplemental office action.